

Title:

Elements for Bringing a Research-Validated Intervention to Scale: Implications for Leadership in Educational Reform

Authors:

Nancy R. Author_1, Florida Atlantic University

Michael R. Author_2, East Carolina University

Abstract (119 words)

An emerging reform emphasis is the identification and sustainability of research-validated initiatives for improving student achievement. Many researchers have noted that the lack of sustainability of effective programs is a barrier to advancing systemic school reform. Reported are findings from a five-year, NSF/IERI-funded project designed to develop and refine a multi-phase scale-up model for concurrently initiating, sustaining, and expanding a systemic, research-validated, intervention, Science IDEAS, in grades 3-5. Described in the paper are (a) the evolution of the scale-up model and (b) the leadership and organizational dynamics used for scale up of the intervention. In doing so, the paper offers perspectives and recommendations applicable to the scale up of any systemic instructional intervention within an ongoing school reform initiative.

*Summary**Objectives/Purpose*

Over the past 20 years, an increasingly important emphasis in school reform has been upon identifying research-validated, instructional initiatives that have the potential to improve student achievement. Building upon this, a complementary research literature has begun to address the related issue of identifying the conditions under which effective instructional initiatives can be sustained (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006) and expanded. For example, in his study of Chicago schools, Payne (1997; 2001) identified problematic elements which cumulatively undermined the implementation of effective reform initiatives. These included dysfunctional relationships among teachers, school administrators, and central administrators which interfered with actual program implementation -- even though all parties were in agreement about goals and means. As others (see Blumenfield, 2000; Coburn, 2003; Dede et al, 2005; Elias et al, 2003; Glennan et al, 2005; Klingner et al, 2003) have noted, the fact that highly effective programs often come and go with little lasting impact is a substantial barrier to advancing systemic school reform.

The purpose of this paper is to report findings emerging from the initial four years of a five-year, NSF/IERI-funded project designed to develop, study, and refine a multi-phase scale-up model that addresses the issue of concurrently expanding and sustaining a systemic, research-validated, instructional intervention, Science IDEAS (Author_1 & Author_2, 2001), in grades 3-5. In doing so, the paper describes (a) the evolution of the multi-phase scale-up model over the past four project years, (b) the organizational dynamics used to implement the scale-up model along with the criteria for establishing its effectiveness, and (c) the leadership and organizational factors necessary for sustaining advocacy for the instructional intervention. The paper also will offer perspectives and recommendations for educational leadership in a form that are applicable to scaling up any systemic instructional intervention within an ongoing school reform initiative.

Perspectives/Theoretical Framework

Understanding the Science IDEAS model as an implementation focus for scale-up. The issues addressed in the paper follow from an understanding of the Science IDEAS intervention

for which the present scale-up model was developed. As described by Author_1 and Author_2 (2001) and Author_2 and Author_1 (2000), Science IDEAS is an integrated instructional model for teaching in-depth science understanding in grades 3-5 within which reading comprehension and language arts are integrated. Science IDEAS is implemented through daily 2-hour instructional blocks that replace traditional reading/language arts instruction. Across daily 2-hour lessons, teachers involve students in activities that focus on understanding science concepts (e.g., reading from text and trade books, hands-on activities, constructing concept-oriented propositional concept maps, journaling, and writing). As a systemic classroom intervention, Science IDEAS provides a stringent test of the project multi-phase scale-up model.

As reported by the Author_1 and Author_2 (2001; 2005), multi-year research findings showed that Science IDEAS students consistently obtained significantly higher achievement than comparable controls in both reading comprehension and science as measured by nationally-normed tests. Across studies, Science IDEAS achievement effects were consistent for both average/above average, and low-SES/minority students (see Author_1 & Author_2, 2001). Research findings also showed that Science IDEAS students displayed a more positive attitude and greater self-esteem in science learning and reading comprehension.

The paper reports how the multi-phase scale-up model used in the present IERI/NSF project has been able to initiate the Science IDEAS intervention on a schoolwide basis in 13 elementary schools over the past 4 years (2002-2006) and to clarify and address the requirements the literature (see Blumenfield, 2000; Coburn, 2003; Dede et al, 2005; Elias et al, 2003; Glennan et al, 2005; Klingner et al, 2003) has identified as necessary to transform a research-validated, instructional intervention from being researcher-initiated on a small scale to school-system-adopted on a large scale (see Author_2 & Author_1, 2004).

In working toward the development of a generalizable scale up model, the present Science IDEAS NSF/IERI project was designed to operate within a leadership and organizational framework that focuses upon two keys recognized as critical for sustained school adoption of any research-based initiative: (a) the adoption of a multi-faceted scale-up process (e.g., Ball & Cohen, 1999; Tyack & Cuban, 1995) and (b) the associated development of the capacity and infrastructure necessary to implement the scale-up process itself (e.g., King & Newmann, 2000; Mussel, 1998). With this in mind, the present project scale-up model (Author_2 & Author_1, 2004) focuses on developing the capacity of a district (and district schools) to implement the instructional intervention on a large scale through an evolutionary process that is feasible to implement within applied school settings.

Key elements of the evolution of the present multi-phase scale up model. The research design (and goal) of the IERI/NSF project was to initiate the successful scale up of the Science IDEAS intervention while studying and documenting the evolution of the model from a research perspective. Within the project, the validity of the multi-phase scale-up design was based on its success in initiating and sustaining the implementation of the Science IDEAS intervention while expanding the use of the intervention to new schools. In turn, given the establishment of the validity of the scale-up model itself, the primary goal of the project was to explicate the constituents of the scale-up process in a fashion that allows it to be transportable to other interventions and settings.

Before overviewing the multi-phase scale up model itself, it is important to recognize that the present Science IDEAS scale-up initiative reflects an explicit research and development (R&D) perspective. The emphasis of such an instructional systems design perspective (e.g., Dick et al, 2004) is that the successful preparation of any educational product requires two major elements: (a) that the desired outcomes can be obtained consistently under specified implementation conditions, and (b) that the implementation of the product in applied settings is engineered to fall within the capacity of the system that is to utilize it (minimizing capacity development requirements). Within the present context, the “reverse-engineering” of such an R&D approach provides a framework for approaching the question of how to scale-up research-

based initiatives within regular school settings. Thus, in our present research project, our definition of scaling is a functional one that establishes as success criteria and links together (a) the fidelity of implementation of an intervention and (b) the performance outcomes established through the prior research for the intervention that are to be met as performance standards. If fidelity of implementation and the associated outcomes can be maintained at existing sites while the intervention is being expanded to new sites, then scale up can be considered successful.

This framework considers scaling from three different perspectives that provide the dynamics for accomplishing the two sets of criteria (fidelity, outcomes) over time. The first considers scaling as a multifaceted process that consists of three overlapping and interdependent conditional criteria relating to the implementation of an instructional intervention: sustainability, expansion to new sites, and supportive institutional dynamics that are necessary to provide the continuing dynamics for scale up support (and sustainability). The overarching key factor is the development of the internal systemic capacity for supporting the expansion of the initial implementation to new sites in a fashion that insures the cumulative sustainability for all. In our scale up design, the establishment of model schools which are able to sustain implementation of an intervention with fidelity and obtain consistent performance outcomes provide the major source of internal systemic capacity for scale up by providing mentoring assistance. The third conditional criteria associated with scaling has to do with the establishment of administrative dynamics in the form of increased student performance expectations that recognize the “added systemic value” provided by the intervention and, therefore, the systemic incentive for sustainability and scale up.

The second perspective of the model considers scaling as a transformational process whose scope encompasses an ordered evolution from a researcher implementation, to a collaborative implementation with school and central administrative personnel of an operational infrastructure for capacity development, to the transfer of the responsibility of the implementation from the researchers to school and central administrators. This second perspective recognizes that an agent must provide an enhanced resource capacity beyond the scope of regular school system operations by operating in a prosthetic fashion to develop the capacity of the school system to sustain and scale up an intervention. In our study, this agent consists of the project staff. The operational details of each of these phases will be discussed in the paper.

The third perspective consists of combining the preceding two perspectives together to provide a conceptual framework for representing essential project scale up operations in a form that is transportable to other settings and for framing research on scale up itself.

Methods/Techniques/Modes of Inquiry

The multi-year study (which is presently ongoing) is being conducted in two large urban school districts in southeastern Florida. A mixed-method research design was used to investigate different aspects of the project. The overall quantitative design to assess academic and affective performance effects of the intervention used a controlled-randomized methodology to compare participating vs. control schools. Fidelity of implementation was assessed using structured classroom observations on 9-week cycles. Professional development evaluations used a previously-validated, objective-oriented Likert scale. Documentation and analysis of different aspects of the project scale-up model were conducted using qualitative data-analysis approaches.

Data Sources/Evidence

Data were collected from four primary sources: participating grade 3-5 teachers (N=260), principals (N=13), grade 3-5 students (N=6200), and project staff. Included as data sources were project/principal fidelity of implementation ratings, preliminary school performance outcomes on nationally-normed and state-administered accountability tests (detailed student longitudinal data are not available until mid-August but will be included in the paper), and evaluations of professional development conducted by teacher leaders/mentors. In addition, the

results of qualitative analyses of different components of the project scale-up model will be summarized from a systems perspective.

Results and Conclusions (Brief Summary)

Operational scale-up/implementation issues addressed. These included (a) adding a formal start-up planning component for new schools to the original scale-up model, (b) limiting new schools to those who had no competing instructional initiatives, (c) expanding the role of the teacher leadership cadre from model classroom implementation to involvement in professional development for new schools, and (d) providing professional support for teachers to gain an in-depth understanding of science concepts within grade level curriculum planning.

Revisions of key project scale-up strategies. These included (a) working with schools and teachers to increase implementation fidelity, (b) working with principals to involve them in the fidelity monitoring process (a key capacity development scale-up component), (c) developing project “talking points” to enhance principal communication (advocacy), and (d) developing district-level commitment to and advocacy for the project in a form that raises the student performance expectations held by the institution itself.

Preliminary project data analysis. These included (a) significantly improved fidelity of implementation trends over the past project year as assessed on a 9-week basis by project staff (the increase in teachers implementing Science IDEAS fully (vs. partially) rose from 43 to 65 percent), (b) school-level achievement summaries for 2002-2003, 2003-2004, 2004-2005, and 2005-2006 showed the average median SAT-9 percentile ranks in grades 3-5 for the project schools in reading were 69 and 70, respectively, while the percent of students in grades 3-5 judged proficient in FCAT reading were 68% and 70% (even though the districts’ regular reading/language arts basal reading programs were not used), and (c) the ratings of all summer (2-week) professional development sessions conducted by Leadership Cadre Teachers for new schools have been consistently rated as highly effective by participants (mean of 3.6 on a 4 3 2 1 scale). The overall effectiveness of the Teacher Cadre was a significant project capacity development accomplishment.

Educational/Scientific Importance

The paper addresses a significant issue in educational leadership for advancing the potential of school reform initiatives to improve student achievement. By framing the process of scale-up as a series of organizational actions adopted by school leaders and school systems, the paper is suggestive of the means to enhance the success of school-based implementations of research-validated instructional interventions. In a related fashion, the elements of the multi-phase scale up model also provide possible reasons why past scale up initiatives within school reform initiatives may have failed.

References

- Author_1, & Author_2. (2005). *A content-focused approach for building knowledge and reading comprehension in upper elementary readers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, San Antonio, TX.
- Author_1, & Author_2. (2001). Implementing an in-depth expanded science model in elementary schools: Multi-year findings, research issues, and policy implications. *International Journal of Science Education*, 23, 373-404.
- Author_2, & Author_1. (2004). *Using an instructional systems development model as a framework for research on scale up*. Technical Report No. 201, NSF/IERI Project, College of Education, Boca Raton, FL: Florida Atlantic University.
- Author_2, & Author_1. (2000). Portfolios in science assessment: A knowledge-based model for classroom practice. In J. J. Mintzes, J. H. Wandersee, and J. D. Novak (Eds.) *Assessing*

- science understanding: A human constructivist view.* (pp. 168-197). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Ball, D., & Cohen, D. K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In G Sykes and L Darling-Hammond (Eds.) *Teaching as a Learning Profession* (pp 3-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blumenfield, P., Fishman, B. J., Krajcik, J., Marx, R. W., & Soloway, E. (2000). Creating usable innovations in systemic reform: Scaling up technology-embedded project-based science in urban schools. *Educational Psychologist*, 35, 149-165.
- Coburn, C. E. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond the numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher*, 32, 3-12.
- Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, and again, and again. *Educational Researcher*, 19, 3-13.
- Dede, C., Honan, J. P., & Peters, L. C. (Eds.) (2005). *Scaling up success: Lessons from technology-based educational improvement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dick, W., Cary, L., & Cary, J. O. (2004). *The systematic design of instruction*. NY: Longman.
- Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Graczyk, P. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2003). Implementation, sustainability, and scaling up of social-emotional and academic innovations in public schools. *School Psychology Review*, 32, 303-320.
- Glennan, T. K., Bodilly, S. J., Galegher, J., & Kerr, K. A. (Eds.) (2004). *Expanding the reach of educational reform: Perspectives from the leaders in the scale-up of educational interventions*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- Hargreaves, A. & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- King, M. B., & Newmann, F. M. (2000). Will teacher learning advance school goals? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 576-580.
- Klingner, J. K., Ahwee, S., Pilonieta, P., & Menendez, R. (2003). Barriers and facilitators in scaling up research practices. *Exceptional Children*, 69, 411-429.
- Marsh, D. D., & LeFever, K. (1997). Educational leadership in a policy context. Paper presented at AERA, Chicago,
- Massell, D. (1998). *State strategies for building capacity in education: Progress and continuing challenges*. (CPRE research Report No. RR-41). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Payne, C. M. (1997). *"I don't want your nasty pot of gold": Urban school climate and public policy*. (Report WP-97-8) ERIC Resources in Education.
- Payne, C. M. (2001). *Sustaining success in school renewal*. Paper presented to the North Carolina Research Council, Duke University.
- Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.